

Applicants have amended claim 1 to more clearly recite the subject matter of the invention. Applicants respectfully submit that the claim 1, as well as the claims depending therefrom, are sufficiently definite and request the withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, objections. No new matter has been added by this amendment.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 4, and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Krock* (U.S. Patent No. 3,600,917), in view of either one of *Feng* (U.S. Patent No. 4,679,282) or *Krauss* (U.S. Patent No. 55,590,444). Further, the Examiner rejected claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Krock*, in view of either one of *Feng* or *Krauss*, and further in view of *Isenmann*. Finally, the Examiner indicated that claims 9 - 11 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

As suggested by the Examiner, claim 1 has been amended to include the features of originally filed claim 9. In addition, as noted above, claim 1 has been amended to overcome rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. As such, claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Moreover, claims 3, 4, 7, 8, 10, and 11, which depend therefrom, are likewise allowable. No new matter has been added by any of the amendments to claim 1.

### **Conclusion**

Applicants respectfully requests that this Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 be entered by the Examiner, placing claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 10, and 11 in condition for allowance. Applicants submit that the proposed amendment of claim 1 does not raise

new issues or necessitate the undertaking of any additional search of the art by the Examiner, since all of the elements and their relationships claimed were either earlier claimed or inherent in the claims as examined. Therefore, this Amendment should allow for immediate action by the Examiner.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully point out that the final action by the Examiner presented some new arguments as to the application of the art against Applicants' invention. It is respectfully submitted that the entering of the Amendment would allow the Applicants to reply to the final rejections and place the application in condition for allowance.

Finally, Applicants submit that the entry of the amendment would place the application in better form for appeal, should the Examiner dispute the patentability of the pending claims.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants submit that this claimed invention, as amended, is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious in view of the prior art references cited against this application. Applicants therefore request the entry of this Amendment, the Examiner's reconsideration and reexamination of the application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our Deposit Account 06-0916.

FINNEGAN  
HENDERSON  
FARABOW  
GARRETT &  
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20005  
202.408.4000  
Fax 202.408.4400  
www.finnegan.com

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: March 18, 2003

By: 

Barry D. Biddle  
Reg. No. 44,033

FINNEGAN  
HENDERSON  
FARABOW  
GARRETT &  
DUNNER <sup>LLP</sup>

1300 I Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20005  
202.408.4000  
Fax 202.408.4400  
[www.finnegan.com](http://www.finnegan.com)